



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/738,104

12/15/2000

Sylvain Cottens

100-8186C/C2

9922

1095

7590

05/31/2005

NOVARTIS
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080

EXAMINER

PESELEV, ELLI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1623

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/738,104	Applicant(s) COTTENS ET AL.	
	Examiner Elli Peselev	Art Unit 1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

pd

Claims 6-10 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 10, 2005.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for cyclosporins and lactam macrolides, does not reasonably provide enablement for "a difficulty soluble active agent" (claim 1) and "macrolide" (claim 2). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors regarding undue experimentation have been summarized in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988) as follows:

- (1) The quantity of experimentation necessary (time and expense);

The terminology "a difficulty soluble active agent" encompasses a very large number of unrelated compounds such as peptides, polymers, steroids, etc. The term "macrolide" encompasses a very large number of compounds such as amphotericin, erythromycin, tylosin, spiramycin, etc. It would take an undue amount of experimentation to determine which specific compounds will be useful in the claimed compositions.

- (2) The amount of direction or guidance presented;

The specification provides no direction or guidance on how to choose specific compounds besides cyclosporins and lactam macrolides.

- (3) The presence or absence of working examples;

The only working examples presented in the specification are directed to cyclosporins and lactam macrolides.

(4) The nature of invention;

The invention is directed to a microemulsion pre-concentrate.

(5) The state of the prior art;

The only microemulsion pre-concentrates known in the prior art are directed to cyclosporins and lactam macrolides.

(6) The predictability or unpredictability of the art;

A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made would not have been able to predict which other compounds besides cyclosporins and lactam macrolides will be useful in the claimed composition.

(7) The breadth of the claims;

Claim 1 encompasses all difficulty soluble agents and claim 2 encompasses all macrolides.

(8) The relative skill of those in the art.

A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made would not have expected all difficulty soluble agents and all macrolides to be useful in the same formulation.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terminology "in any preceding claim" renders claim 4 indefinite since the claim numbers have not been set forth.

Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

The preliminary amendment has not been entered because it fails to present all claims.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Woo (U.S. Patent No. 5,603,951).

Woo discloses the claimed microemulsion preconcentrate comprising cyclosporine, dimethylisosorbide, a lipophilic phase and a surfactant (column 4, lines 54-59).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fricker et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,932,243) in view of Woo (U.S. Patent No. 5,03,951).

Fricker et al disclose a microemulsion preconcentrate comprising a lactam macrolide, a hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic phase and a surfactant (column 3) but do not disclose the addition of dimethylisosorbide. However, since Woo teaches the advantage of using dimethylisosorbide in microemulsion preconcentrate compositions, such as improves stability (column 5, ins 19-27), a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time he instant invention was made would have been motivated to use dimethylisosorbide in the microemulsion composition disclosed by Fricker et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elli Peselev

elli peselev
ELLI PESELEV
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200